

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of March 4, 2009 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of the claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

independent claims 1 and 17 are amended to specify that the processing system/processor has a plurality of different digital ink searching algorithms which are each specialized to respectively different specialized formats of digital ink, that the digital ink searching algorithm which is specialized to the determined specialized format of the input digital ink is selected, the input digital ink is processed in the processing system/processor in accordance with the selected digital ink searching algorithm, where the processing includes segmenting the input digital ink into feature vectors and the segmenting is specific to the specialized format of the input digital ink, and that the database is searched for a match to the search input query by utilising the processed input digital ink and selected digital ink searching algorithm; and

dependent claims 2-16 and 18-23 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application as the amended features are described, for example, at page 14, lines 8-23 of the present specification.

Regarding 35 USC 101 Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter, for at least The following reasons.

Firstly, both pending (and amended) independent claims 1 and 17 clearly recite the hardware used to perform each of the claimed method steps and functions, For example, independent claim 1 clearly recites a "processing system" and independent claim 17 clearly recites an "input device", "storage device" and a "processor".

Secondly, the section of the description of the present specification cited by the Examiner is in the "Background Art" section of the present specification, and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art understands that this description is a discussion of the state of the art related to the present invention and not indicative of the features of the claimed invention itself.

Further, pending (and amended) independent claims 1 and 17, and their respective dependent claims, merely recite that search input queries are received and processed and do not include the manner in which search queries are input or received. Furthermore, even if the claimed invention did include the manner in which search queries are input or received, the fact that this manner may include wireless transmission would not render the claimed invention directed to non-statutory subject matter, because the claimed invention itself would still be directed to the manner in which the search input queries are processed not the manner of communication *per se*.

Regarding 35 USC 102(b) Rejections and Response to Arguments

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 17, and claims 2-16 and 18-23, is not disclosed or suggested by Lopresti, because in each of the embodiments disclosed by Lopresti the same segmentation of the input annotations is used regardless of the format of the annotations (see col. 7, line 23-col. 8, line 65 and Fig. 9), not specialised processing and segmentation as is required by the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Jonathon Leigh Napper



Paul Lapstun



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762